

To: CESJ Elders  
From: Suzanne SooHoo  
Cesar Rossatto  
Program Co-chairs  
Date: January 11, 2004  
RE: Program Progress Report

Following are highlights of our work to date:

We received 9 group proposals and 16 individual proposals. AERA records showed we are the 9<sup>th</sup> largest SIG in AERA with 193 members, thus awarding us initially 5 substantive sessions, 1 business meeting and two roundtable sessions (up to 7 proposals per session). In the 11<sup>th</sup> hour, AERA quickly decided to award one more substantive session to the top ten largest SIGs.

One group and two individual proposals were inadequately processed because AERA or the individuals were not able to upload their proposals. Overall AERA reported more than 150 “lost proposals” attributed to the conversion to a new system. This situation led to a series of challenges.

- a. A proposal from UK was never received as per our email messages from authors. They will resubmit next year.
- b. Two proposals were sent out as abstracts only, forcing us to review the proposals through the courtesy of available colleagues. Some of our colleagues were not signed up as reviewers therefore they could not enter their ratings electronically.

The decision was made to send proposals out to 5 readers as a way to increase membership involvement. Overall 77 reviewers were involved, using AERA’s criteria for best matches.

The proposal selection criteria that was used came from AERA’s generic template:

Choice of problem  
Theoretical framework  
Methods  
Data Source  
Quality of Writing/Organization  
Conclusions/Interpretations  
Contribution to Field

Membership Appeal  
Would you attend?  
Overall Recommendation

An email has been sent to the program committee this week to solicit its input for new criteria. So far, we have received:

Mara: commitment to social justice, issues of equity, power, race

All group proposals with an overall score of 4.0 or higher and individual proposals with a 3.0 or higher were accepted, resulting in the following program. The two proposals which were not uploaded were handled in the following manner:

- They were sent out for review (Suzi sent her to elders, Cesar sent his to his colleagues).
- One proposal was rejected almost unanimously across the board.
- For the second proposal, the highest and lowest ratings were dropped and the remaining rating determined its eligibility.

This seem to be the only fair way to deal with these outliers since very few of the evaluations for these proposals received numerical rankings.

Program:

**Voices on the Margins: Collaborative and individual approaches to addressing whiteness in the classroom and sustaining an identity as an anti-racist, critical multicultural educator** (Notified)

AERA-sess-3028-10057

**Placing Equity Center Stage: Preparing Critical Educators** (Notified)

AERA-sess-3028-10251

**Chicana/o Activism and Education: Theories and Pedagogies of Trans/formation** (Notified)

AERA-sess-3028-10310

**A Call for Deliberative Dialogue Across Differences in Educational Research Methodologies: Democracy, Accountability and Credibility** (Notified)

AERA-sess-3028-11132

**Town Meeting on Developing Standards for Social and Environmental Justice Education** (Notified)

AERA-sess-3028-11203

**Culturally Relevant Planning & Evaluation: A Native American Perspective** (Notified)

AERA-sess-3028-11840

**CESJ Business Meeting - Facilitated by Antonia Darder** (Notified)

AERA-sess-3028-13062

**Design and Redesigning Social Justice** (Notified)

AERA-sess-3028-13077

**Building Capacity for Critical Social Consciousness and Social Justice** (Notified)

AERA-sess-3028-13078

All documents tracking our decisions are attached and will be given to Sally Thomas, CESJ chair.